

REMARKS

Claim rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-6 are still rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nelson in view of Litwinski. It is asserted that Litwinski teaches a support mandrel that can be used with the tools of Nelson.

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of claims 1-6. Regarding claim 1, Applicant has amended claim 1 in light of Litwinski to more distinctly claim the subject matter of the invention. Claim 1 has been amended to include all of the subject matter of claim 10. Accordingly, claim 1 now gives specific limitations as to the structure of the support mandrel that is used in the present invention, and which is illustrated in figure 9.

A coiled sheet of material can function as a surface of the support mandrel. An inflatable inside the coiled sheet is expanded, causing the coiled sheet to partially uncoil and be pressed against a non-planar surface.

Regarding claim 2, this claim is allowable for being dependent upon an allowable independent claim.

Regarding claim 3, this claim is allowable for being dependent upon an allowable independent claim.

Regarding claim 4, this claim is allowable for being dependent upon an allowable independent claim.

Regarding claim 5, this claim is allowable for being dependent upon an allowable independent claim.

Regarding claim 6, this claim is allowable for being dependent upon an allowable independent claim.

Claims 7-9 are rejected as being unpatentable over Nelson in view of Litwinski, and further in view of Packer. It is asserted that Packer teaches the diffusion preventing material of the anvil.

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of claims 7-9. Regarding claim 7, this claim is allowable for being dependent upon an allowable independent claim.

Regarding claim 8, this claim is allowable for being dependent upon an allowable independent claim.

Regarding claim 9, this claim is allowable for being dependent upon an allowable independent claim.

New claims 47-52 are also added by this amendment. Each of these claims is independent, and each introduces a different support mandrel as defined in figures 10 through 15. The subject matter of these claims was previously claimed in dependent claims 10-16. However, each claim is now in independent form, and each claim adds a novel structure for a support mandrel that is not taught or suggested by Litwinski.

Conclusion

In light of the statements above, Applicant respectfully requests of claims 1-9 and new independent claims 47-52. If any impediment to the allowance of these claims

Application Serial No. 10/769,551
Amendment dated 4/28/2006
Reply to Office Action dated 2/28/2006

Commissioner for Patents
Page 11

remains after entry of this Amendment, and such impediment could be alleviated during a telephone interview, the examiner is invited to call David W. O'Bryant at (801) 478-0071 so that such matters may be resolved as expeditiously as possible.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fee or to credit any overpayment in connection with this Amendment to Deposit Account No. 50-0881.

DATED this 28th day of April, 2006.

Respectfully submitted,



David W. O'Bryant
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 39,793
MORRISS O'BRYANT COMPAGNI, P.C.
136 South Main Street, Suite 700
Salt Lake City, Utah 84101
(801) 478-0071 telephone
(801) 478-0076 facsimile